

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 7, 13, 22 and 31 are amended herein. Claims 1-31 remain pending in the application.

**Abstract of the Disclosure**

The Abstract of the Disclosure was objected to as allegedly failing to comply with PTO recommended guidelines.

A substitute Abstract of the Disclosure is attached hereto. The Examiner is respectfully requested to replace the originally filed Abstract of the Disclosure with the one attached hereto.

**Claims 1-16, 20-25 and 29-31 over McDowell**

In the Office Action, claims 1-16, 20-25 and 29-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by McDowell et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication US2001/0034224 A1 ("McDowell"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

McDowell is a publication of a patent application filed on January 26, 2001, which is its relevant 35 U.S.C. §102(e) date. This does not predate the filing date of the present application. The provisional application filing date, January 26, 2000, that the Examiner has apparently underlined can not be relied on since the degree of disclosure on that date is unknown. The publication of the later filed McDowell application is not prior art with respect to the claims of the present application.

Moreover, 35 U.S.C. §102(e) requires the cited prior art to be "an application for patent". A provisional application is **NOT** an application for patent as required by the statute. Therefore, McDowell is does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-16, 20-25 and 29-31 is improper over the Nelson Application Publication cited. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

**Claims 17-19 and 26-28 over McDowell in view of Sandegren**

In the Office Action, claims 17-19 and 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over McDowell in view of Sandegren, U.S. Patent No. 6,512,930 ("Sandegren"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As discussed above, McDowell is not prior art with respect to the claims of the present application. The rejection on its face cannot stand on Sandegren alone.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 17-19 and 26-28 is improper over the McDowell cited. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

**Comments for McDowell and Sandegren**

Claims 1-31 recite an apparatus and method that forwards a registration notification message and an MSInactivity message received over a TCP/IP connection.

McDowell appears to disclose a system and method for sharing user event information such as presence information on a network among mobile devices and those connected to fixed IP networks such as the Internet (Abstract). When a mobile device is turned on, the mobile device informs a mobile event server (MES) of the presence on the network and the MES broadcasts the presence to appropriate services and users (McDowell, 0034). A mobile service center (MSC) connected to an SS7 network sends SS7 messages to a home location register (HLR), the HLR connects to the MES (McDowell, 0056-0057; Fig. 10a). The MES informs a chat server that a cellular phone user is online (McDowell, 0030). In an alternate embodiment, an SS7 link is used to connect the MES and a service transfer point (STP) for detection of mobile device activity (McDowell, Fig. 6a and 6b).

McDowell discloses sending an MES notification of when a mobile device is turned on. The MES forwards the notification to a chat server. The MES receives notification messages over an SS7 link. McDowell fails to disclose

a method and apparatus that forwards a registration notification message and an MSInactivity message received over a TCP/IP connection, as recited by claims 1-31.

Sandegren appears to disclose a system that notified a first user of a mobile communication device about status of other users in a mobile communications system (Abstract). A user can establish a list of individuals whose status is of interest to him (Sandegren, col. 3, lines 1-3). The list of individuals may be recipients of a call, a data transmission, or any other type of communication from a user (Sandegren, col. 3, lines 3-6).


Sandegren discloses all of the messages within the system are sent to components within the wireless system. Sandegren fails to disclose or suggest forwarding any type of messages outside of the wireless system over an Internet connection, much less disclose or suggest a method and apparatus that forwards a registration notification message and an MSInactivity message received over a TCP/IP connection, as recited by claims 1-31.

A benefit of forwarding a registration notification message and an MSInactivity message received over a TCP/IP connection, e.g., is portability. The cited prior art requires an SS7 link to connect the MES that receives notification messages. An SS7 link requires the MES to be connected to the telephone network. A TCP/IP connection allows a message receiver to be connected to any TCP/IP compatible connection, possibly nowhere near the telephone network being monitored. This gives the advantage of portability. The cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest a method and apparatus that has such benefits.

**Conclusion**

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC



William H. Bollman  
Reg. No.: 36,457  
Tel. (202) 261-1020  
Fax. (202) 887-0336

2000 M Street, N.W. 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington D.C. 20036-3307

WHB/df